



Appeal Brief Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37
Attorney Docket No.: 019287-0317258
Application Serial No.: 09/577,232

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPELLANT : Lundy LEWIS	CONFIRMATION No.: 3633
SERIAL NUMBER : 09/577,232	EXAMINER: David E. England
FILING DATE : May 23, 2000	ART UNIT: 2143
FOR : METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR SERVICE ANALYSIS IN SERVICE LEVEL MANAGEMENT (SLM)	

**Appellant's Brief on Appeal
Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Further to the Notice of Appeal dated January 23, 2007, Appellant hereby submits Appellant's Brief of Appeal pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.37.

The Director is authorized to charge the \$500.00 fee for filing an Appeal Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2), as well as any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 033975 (Ref. No. 019287-0317258).

04/24/2007 YPOLITE1 00000016 033975 09577232
02 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Appeal Brief Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

I. Real Party in Interest

Computer Associates Think, Inc. owns the entire right, title, and interest to the present application. Accordingly, Computer Associates Think, Inc. is the real party in interest, although the recorded assignment indicates that Aprisma Management Technologies, Inc. is the present assignee of the application.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

The above-referenced application claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. 60/135,492, filed May 24, 1999, entitled "Method and Apparatus for Service Level Management."

Computer Associates Think, Inc. is further pursuing Appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the cases identified below, each of which also claim priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. 60/135,492.

(1) U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/577,225, filed May 23, 2000, entitled "Service Level Management." A Notice of Appeal was filed on April 20, 2007.

(2) U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/577,224, filed May 23, 2000, entitled "Method and Apparatus for Reactive and Deliberative Service Level Management (SLM)." Appellant's Brief on Appeal was filed on January 3, 2007.

III. Status of Claims

Pending: Claims 31-59 are pending.
Cancelled: Claims 1-30 are cancelled.
Rejected: Claims 31-59 stand rejected.
Allowed: No claims have been allowed.
On Appeal: Claims 31-59 are appealed.

IV. Status of Amendments

No claim amendments have been filed subsequent to the Final Office Action dated October 23, 2006 (hereinafter “Final Action”).

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The following exemplary citations to the Specification and/or drawing figures are not exclusive, as other examples of support for claimed subject matter exist. As such, the following citations should not be viewed as limiting.

Independent Claim 31

According to various aspects of the invention, as recited in claim 31, for example, provided is a method for service level management of a business process in connection with a computer network (e.g., Specification at 1, line 29 - 2, line 12). The business process may be supported by a service operated on the computer network (e.g., Specification at 19, line 14 – 20, line 18), wherein the service may supported by at least one network component within the computer network (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-18). The service may be provided at an agreed upon service level (e.g., Specification at 2, lines 22-29; 20, line 29 – 21 line 8), where a measure of performance of the service may indicate a current service level of the business process (e.g., Specification at 18, line 25 – 19, line 21).

In various implementations, the method of providing service level management may include, among other things, measuring a component parameter of the at least one network component (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 22-25; 21, lines 11-28), and determining a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the service (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-21, 26-28; 32, lines 16-30).

The measured component parameter may indicate an operational characteristic of the at least one network component (e.g., Specification at 19, lines 10-12; 20, lines 22-25), and the determined service parameter may have a state used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-25, 29-30). As such, the service

level may be managed by determining an effect of the measured component parameter on the state of the service parameter (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 26-28; 23, lines 5-10, 18-26).

Independent Claim 39

According to various aspects of the invention, as recited in claim 39, for example, a method is provided for implementing service level management of a business process in connection with a computer network (e.g., Specification at 1, line 29 - 2, line 12). The business process may be supported by a service (e.g., Specification at 19, line 14 – 20, line 18), which may further be supported by one or more network entities (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-18). The one or more network entities may be addressed by the computer network to manage the service (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 22-25; 21, lines 11-28).

In various implementations, the method for implementing service level management may include, among other things, identifying a plurality of component parameters associated with one or more network entities of the computer network (e.g., Specification at 33, lines 1-29), and designating one of the plurality of component parameters as a service parameter (e.g., Specification at 33, lines 12-16).

The service parameter may provide an indication of a state of the service supporting the business process (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-25, 29-30), such that a level of the service, which may indicate a measure of performance of the service (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 29-30), can be determined from the service parameter (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 19-21, 29-30). As such, the measure of service performance can be used to manage the business process supported by the service (e.g., Specification at 32, lines 16-30), such as by determining, based on the plurality of component parameters, how the plurality of component parameters affect the service parameter to manage the service associated with the network (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 26-28; 23, lines 5-10, 18-26).

Independent Claim 46

According to various aspects of the invention, as recited in claim 46, for example, a device readable medium may hold device executable instructions for executing a method of providing service level management of a business process in connection with a computer

network (e.g., Specification at 1, line 29 - 2, line 12). The business process may be supported by a service operated on the computer network (e.g., Specification at 19, line 14 – 20, line 18), wherein the service may supported by at least one network component within the computer network (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-18). The service may be provided at an agreed upon service level (e.g., Specification at 2, lines 22-29; 20, line 29 – 21 line 8), where a measure of performance of the service may indicate a current service level of the business process (e.g., Specification at 18, line 25 – 19, line 21).

In various implementations, the method of providing service level management may include, among other things, measuring a component parameter of the at least one network component (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 22-25; 21, lines 11-28), and determining a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the service (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-21, 26-28; 32, lines 16-30).

The measured component parameter may indicate an operational characteristic of the at least one network component (e.g., Specification at 19, lines 10-12; 20, lines 22-25), and the determined service parameter may have a state used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-25, 29-30). As such, the service level may be managed by determining an effect of the measured component parameter on the state of the service parameter (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 26-28; 23, lines 5-10, 18-26).

Independent Claim 53

According to various aspects of the invention, as recited in claim 53, for example, a device readable medium may hold device executable instructions for executing a method of implementing service level management of a business process in connection with a computer network (e.g., Specification at 1, line 29 - 2, line 12). The business process may be supported by a service (e.g., Specification at 19, line 14 – 20, line 18), which may further be supported by one or more network entities (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-18). The one or more network entities may be addressed by the computer network to manage the service (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 22-25; 21, lines 11-28).

In various implementations, the method for implementing service level management may include, among other things, identifying a plurality of component parameters associated with one or more network entities of the computer network (e.g., Specification at 33, lines 1-29), and designating one of the plurality of component parameters as a service parameter (e.g., Specification at 33, lines 12-16).

The service parameter may provide an indication of a state of the service supporting the business process (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-25, 29-30), such that a level of the service, which may indicate a measure of performance of the service (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 29-30), can be determined from the service parameter (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 19-21, 29-30). As such, the measure of service performance can be used to manage the business process supported by the service (e.g., Specification at 32, lines 16-30), such as by determining, based on the plurality of component parameters, how the plurality of component parameters affect the service parameter to manage the service associated with the network (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 26-28; 23, lines 5-10, 18-26).

Independent Claim 59

According to various aspects of the invention, as recited in claim 59, for example, provided is a method for service level management of a business process in connection with a computer network (e.g., Specification at 1, line 29 - 2, line 12). The business process may be supported by a service operated on the computer network (e.g., Specification at 19, line 14 - 20, line 18), wherein the service may supported by at least one network component within the computer network (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-18). The service may be provided at an agreed upon service level (e.g., Specification at 2, lines 22-29; 20, line 29 - 21 line 8), where a measure of performance of the service may indicate a current service level of the business process (e.g., Specification at 18, line 25 - 19, line 21).

In various implementations, the method of providing service level management may include, among other things, measuring a component parameter of the at least one network component (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 22-25; 21, lines 11-28), and determining a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the service (e.g., Specification at 20,

lines 11-21, 26-28; 32, lines 16-30). Further, the component parameter may be measured while the at least one network component operates to support the service (e.g., Specification at 65, lines 9-28).

The measured component parameter may indicate an operational characteristic of the at least one network component (e.g., Specification at 19, lines 10-12; 20, lines 22-25), and the determined service parameter may have a state used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 11-25, 29-30). As such, the service level may be managed while the at least one network component operates to support the service (e.g., Specification at 65, lines 9-28) by determining an effect of the measured component parameter on the state of the service parameter (e.g., Specification at 20, lines 26-28; 23, lines 5-10, 18-26).

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

(1) The Examiner has rejected claims 31-32, 34-36, 38-43, 45-47, 49-51, 53-57, and 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,449 to Glitho et al. ("Glitho"). Final Action at 2-5.

(2) The Examiner has rejected claims 33 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Glitho in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,449,603 to Hunter ("Hunter"). Final Action at 6-7.

(3) The Examiner has rejected claims 37, 44, 52, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Glitho in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,755 to Yemini et al. ("Yemini"). Final Action at 7-8.

VII. Argument

A. *Glitho Fails To Disclose Each and Every Feature of Claims 31-32, 34-36, 38-43, 45-47, 49-51, and 53-57.*

In order for a claim to be anticipated, the reference relied upon must disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, the reference must describe the

invention in as complete detail as recited in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). In the instant case, the rejection of claims 31-32, 34-36, 38-43, 45-47, 49-51, 53-57, and 59 as allegedly being anticipated by Glitho is legally improper, and should be reversed, for at least the reason that Glitho fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, and further fails to disclose the invention in as complete detail as recited in the claims.

More particularly, Glitho fails to disclose at least the features of “determining a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the service,” or “determining an effect of the measured component parameter on the state of the service parameter,” where the state may be “used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level,” as recited in claim 31, for example. The Examiner, however, relies upon various portions of Glitho (i.e., col. 1, line 43 – col. 2, line 29; col. 4, lines 10-28; col. 4, line 55 – col. 6, line 35; and col. 7, lines 21-45) as allegedly teaching these features.

Appellant disagrees with the Examiner’s assessment for various reasons. For example, among other things, claim 31 recites using a service parameter to represent a measure of performance for a given service. The service, which supports a business process, may itself be supported by at least one network component, an operational characteristic of which (i.e., a component parameter) may be measured. The measured component parameter is related to the service by determining its effect on a state of the service parameter. Thus, the claimed invention uses the service parameter state to provide service level management for the business process. For instance, claim 31 recites using the state of the service parameter to determine whether the service conforms to an agreed upon service level (i.e., based on an effect the measured component parameter has on the state of the service parameter).

By contrast, Glitho relates to using preprocessed network element data to monitor performance and quality of service (QoS) in a network (e.g., col. 4, line 30 – col. 5, line 11, “the preprocessed data enters the [operation and maintenance control point (OMCP)] through a Performance and Quality of Service (QoS) Monitoring (PQSM) function,” “The OMCP uses the PQSM function to monitor performance and QoS in the network.”). Glitho does not, however, disclose “determining a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the

service,” or “determining an effect of the measured component parameter on the state of the service parameter,” where the state may be “used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level,” as recited in claim 31, for example.

Assuming *arguendo* that similarities may exist between “a component parameter” and raw data that has been preprocessed by a network element, Glitho nonetheless fails to disclose “determining an effect of the [preprocessed data] on the state of the service parameter.” Rather, Glitho’s monitoring function analyzes the preprocessed data to determine “whether there is a problem with the QoS” (col. 4, line 55 – col. 5, lines 11). Even if Glitho determines whether network element data reflects degradation in QoS, Glitho does not make the QoS determination based on how the network element data affects a service parameter state. At best, Glitho uses network element data, not a service parameter’s state, to determine whether QoS degradation has occurred. As such, Glitho does not disclose, among other things, “a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the service,” or that the service parameter has a “state used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level,” as recited in claim 31, for example.

In response to previous arguments addressing this issue, the Examiner identifies passages of Glitho relating to an “agreed upon QUALITY OF SERVICE,” where “it is expected that the network ‘conform’ or at least meet the agreed upon quality of service that is given to a network node.” Final Action at 9. It is apparent, therefore, that the Examiner equates determining QoS degradation, as disclosed in Glitho, with determining “conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level,” as recited in claim 31, for example. Assuming *arguendo* that similarities exist between QoS and “service level,” the Examiner must still meet the burden of establishing that Glitho discloses a “service parameter having a state used to determine conformity” to the agreed upon QoS, as recited in claim 31.

The Examiner continues to allege that “Glitho teaches such a limitation . . . ‘where the performance data is analyzed for quality of service at 74, and if a predefined threshold is crossed, or otherwise interpretation of state of an agreed upon service, an event may be generated indicating that levels of expected QoS have not been reached.’” Final Action at 9. This statement, on its face, fails to identify a “service parameter having a state,” as recited in

claim 31. Rather, the Examiner identifies the predefined threshold disclosed in Glitho as being a “state of an agreed upon service.” As such, although the Examiner equates QoS to service level, and a predefined threshold to a state of a service, nothing in Glitho has been identified as disclosing or otherwise teaching a “service parameter having a state,” as recited in claim 3.

For example, even if the Examiner’s allegations are all taken to be true, for the sake of argument, the Examiner has nonetheless failed to identify any aspect of Glitho that relates to “a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the service,” or that the service parameter has “state used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level,” as recited in claim 31, for example. As discussed in greater detail above, the claimed invention includes distinctions for “service,” “service level,” “service parameter,” and “state of the service parameter.” The Examiner has neither established that Glitho discloses each and every one of these features, nor that Glitho uses these features as recited in the claim. For at least these reasons, the rejection is legally improper and should be reversed.

Claims 39, 46, 53, and 59 include features similar to those set forth in claim 31. Claims 32, 34-36, 38, 40-43, 45, 47, 49-51, and 54-57 depend from and add features to one of claims 31, 39, 46, and 53. Thus, the rejection of these claims is likewise legally improper and should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

B. Glitho and Hunter, Either Alone or in Combination, Fail to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest Each and Every Feature of Claims 33 and 48.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the references relied upon, either individually or when combined, must disclose, teach, or suggest every feature of the claimed invention. *Oetiker*, 977 F.2d at 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1444. In the instant case, the rejection of claims 33 and 48 as allegedly being unpatentable over Glitho in view of Hunter is legally improper, and should be reversed, for at least the reason that the references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

More particularly, for at least the reasons given above in subsection A, Glitho fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature of claims 31 and 46. Claims 33 and 48 depend from and add features to one of claims 31 and 46. Thus, the rejection of these claims

is likewise legally improper and should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as presented for their respective parent claims.

C. *Glitho and Yemeni, Either Alone or in Combination, Fail to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest Each and Every Feature of Claims 37, 44, 52, and 58.*

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the references relied upon, either individually or when combined, must disclose, teach, or suggest every feature of the claimed invention. *Oetiker*, 977 F.2d at 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1444. In the instant case, the rejection of claims 37, 44, 52, and 58 as allegedly being unpatentable over Glitho in view of Yemeni is legally improper, and should be reversed, for at least the reason that the references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

More particularly, for at least the reasons given above in subsection A, Glitho fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature of claims 31, 39, 46, and 53. Claims 37, 44, 52, and 58 depend from and add features to one of claims 31, 39, 46, and 53. Thus, the rejection of these claims is likewise legally improper and should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as presented for their respective parent claims.

VIII. Claims Appendix

The pending claims (claims 31-59) are attached in **Appendix A**.

IX. Evidence Appendix

Appendix B: None.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

Appendix C: None.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable over the references relied upon by the Examiner. Therefore, reversal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Date: April 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Rick A. Toering

Registration No. 43,195

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

P.O. Box 10500

McLean, Virginia 22102

Main: 703-770-7900

Fax: 703-770-7901

Appendix A: Claims Appendix

1-30. (Cancelled)

31. (Previously Presented) A method of providing service level management of a business process in connection with a computer network, wherein the business process is supported by a service operated on the computer network, wherein the service is supported by at least one network component within the computer network, wherein the service is to be provided at an agreed upon service level, and wherein a measure of performance of the service indicates a current service level of the business process, the method comprising:

measuring a component parameter of the at least one network component, the component parameter indicating an operational characteristic of the at least one network component;

determining a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the service, the service parameter having a state used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level; and

determining an effect of the measured component parameter on the state of the service parameter.

32. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 31, further comprising determining an effect the component parameter has on the service parameter, the determination comprising one or more of:

- a data mining based process;
- a neural network based process;
- a machine learning based process;
- an iterative dichotomizing third derivative based process;
- an algorithm based process; and
- a selected statistical based process.

33. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 31, further comprising representing an effect of the component parameter on the service parameter, wherein the representation includes one or more of:

- a decision tree;
- a propositional statement;
- a quantified statement;
- a weighted listing; and
- a graph.

34. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 31, wherein the service parameter represents one or more of:

- a response time of a network resource;
- traffic congestion of a selected portion of the network;
- availability of a network resource;
- reliability of a network resource;
- security of a network resource;
- performance of a network resource; and
- configuration of a network resource.

35. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 31, wherein the network component is associated with a network component monitoring agent of a network management system.

36. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 35, further comprising determining interfaces between the network component and the network component monitoring agent.

37. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 31, wherein the service level management domain comprises a plurality of management applications integrated into a hierarchical structure having a plurality of layers.

38. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 31, wherein the network component comprises one or more of:

- a transmission device,
- a transmission media,
- a computer system, and
- an application.

39. **(Previously Presented)** A method of implementing service level management of a business process in connection with a computer network, wherein the business process is supported by a service, wherein the service is supported by the one or more network entities, and wherein the one or more network entities are addressable by the computer network to manage the service, the method comprising:

- identifying a plurality of component parameters associated with one or more network entities of the computer network;

- designating one of the plurality of component parameters as a service parameter, the service parameter providing an indication of a state of the service supporting the business process;

- determining a level of the service from the service parameter, the level of the service indicative of a measure of performance of the service, the measure of performance of the service enabling management of the business process supported by the service; and

- determining, based on the plurality of component parameters, how the plurality of component parameters affect the service parameter to manage the service associated with the network.

40. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 39, further comprising storing the plurality of component parameters associated with the one or more network entities in a storage device.

41. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 39, further comprising managing the network based on the state of the service indicated by the service parameter.

42. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 39, further comprising instructing the one or more network entities addressable by the network to take an action based on the state of the service indicated by the service parameter.

43. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 42, further comprising interfacing with a management platform associated with the network to manage the service associated with the network.

44. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 39, wherein the service level management domain comprises a plurality of management applications arranged in a hierarchical manner.

45. **(Previously Presented)** The method of claim 39, wherein the network component comprises one or more of:

- a transmission device,
- a transmission media,
- a computer system, and
- an application.

46. **(Previously Presented)** A device readable medium holding device executable instructions for executing a method of providing service level management of a business process in connection with a computer network, wherein the business process is supported by a service operated on the computer network, wherein the service is supported by at least one network component within the computer network, wherein the service is to be provided at an agreed upon service level, and wherein a measure of performance of the service indicates a current service level of the business process, the method comprising:

measuring a component parameter of the at least one network component, the component parameter indicating an operational characteristic of the at least one network component;

determining a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the service, the service parameter having a state used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level; and

determining an effect of the measured component parameter on the state of the service parameter.

47. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 46, further comprising determining how the component parameter has an effect on the service parameter using one or more of:

- a data mining based process;
- a neural network based process;
- a machine learning based process;
- an IDS derivative (iterative dichotomizing third) based process;
- an algorithm based process; and
- a selected statistical based process.

48. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 46, further comprising representing how the effect of the component parameter on the service parameter by one or more of:

- a decision tree;
- a propositional statement;
- a quantified statement;
- a weighted listing; and
- a graph.

49. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 46, wherein the service parameter of the service represents one or more of

- a response time of a network resource;

traffic congestion of a selected portion of the network;
availability of a network resource;
reliability of a network resource;
security of a network resource;
performance of a network resource; and
configuration of a network resource.

50. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 46, wherein the network component is associated with a network component monitoring agent of a network management system.

51. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 50, further comprising determining interfaces between the network component and the network component monitoring agent to provide service level management in the network.

52. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 46, wherein the service level management domain comprises a plurality of executable applications arranged in a hierarchical manner.

53. **(Previously Presented)** A device readable medium holding device executable instructions for executing a method of implementing service level management of a business process in connection with a computer network, wherein the business process is supported by a service, wherein the service is supported by the one or more network entities, and wherein the one or more network entities are addressable by the computer network to manage the service, the method comprising:

identifying a plurality of component parameters associated with one or more network entities of the computer network;

designating one of the plurality of component parameters as a service parameter, the service parameter providing an indication of a state of the service supporting the business process;

determining a level of the service from the service parameter, the level of the service indicative of a measure of performance of the service, the measure of performance of the service enabling management of the business process supported by the service; and

determining, based on the plurality of component parameters, how the plurality of component parameters affect the service parameter to manage the service associated with the network.

54. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 53, further comprising storing the plurality of component parameters associated with the one or more network entities in a storage device.

55. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 53, further comprising managing the network based on the state of the service indicated by the service parameter.

56. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 53, further comprising instructing the one or more network entities addressable by the network to take an action based on the state of the service indicated by the service parameter.

57. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 56, further comprising interfacing with a management platform associated with the network to manage the service associated with the network.

58. **(Previously Presented)** The medium of claim 53, wherein the service level management domain comprises a plurality of executable applications performing a plurality of functions in a hierarchical manner.

59. **(Previously Presented)** A method of providing service level management of a business process in connection with a computer network, wherein the business process is supported by a service operated on the computer network, wherein the service is supported by at least one

network component within the computer network, wherein the service is to be provided at an agreed upon service level, and wherein a measure of performance of the service indicates a current service level of the business process, the method comprising:

measuring a component parameter of the at least one network component while the at least one network component is operating to support the service, the component parameter indicating an operational characteristic of the at least one network component;

determining a service parameter representative of a measure of performance of the service, the service parameter having a state used to determine conformity of the service to the agreed upon service level; and

determining an effect of the measured component parameter on the state of the service parameter while the at least one network component is operating to support the service.

Appendix B: Evidence Appendix

NONE

Appendix C: Related Proceedings Appendix

NONE